UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/083,550	02/27/2002	Kazuhito Rokutan	ASAM.0051	5577	
38327 REED SMITH	7590 10/07/200 LLP	EXAMINER			
	W PARK DRIVE, SUI	DEJONG, ERIC S			
FALLS CHUR	СП, VA 22042	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1631		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/07/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/083,550	ROKUTAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ERIC S. DEJONG	1631		

	ERIC S. DEJONG	1631				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi ral (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the second sec	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	isideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	•	_			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2-10</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).			
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but see continuation sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Fric S Do Jona/					
	/Eric S DeJong/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1631				

Continuation of Item 7. NOTE

The Information Disclosure statement will not be entered onto the record at this time because it was filed after prosecution was closed in the instant case, see DIS filed 06/19/2008 and it entry would require further consideration and/or search of the prior art.

Continuation of Item 11. NOTE:

The rejection of claim 11 is maintained for reasons of record.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chenchik et al.

In regard to the rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 102(b), applicants argue reiterate previously presented arguments directed toawrd the deficiencies of Chenchik et al.

In response, applicants reiterated arguments are not persuasive for the reasons of record.

Applicants further argue that Chechnik et al. fails to teach the recited categories of (1)-(9).

In response it is maintained and reiterated from the instant rejection that Table 5 of Chechnik et al. teaches a pluirality of biopolymer sequences that read on the gene classification functions as recited in the instant claims (see pages 3-6 of the previous Office action, mailed 05/28/2008). Applicants argument amounts only to an allegation that the instant claims are differentiated over the prior art as said argument does not offer any evidence or identify any specific feature lacking in the prior art that would otherwise differentiate the bioplymers as taught in Table 5 from biopolymers that are encompassed under the recited categories of (1)-(9).